



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,340	07/24/2003	Heng Chu	RSW920030074US1	9120
43168	7590	07/24/2008		
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM PO BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742			EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/626,340	Applicant(s) CHU ET AL.	
	Examiner KIMBERLY LOVEL	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 29 April 2008.
2. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 are currently pending and claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 14-19 and 21-30 are canceled. In the Amendment filed 29 April 2008, claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 20 and 31-33 are amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejection of claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-33 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0149847 to Chandler in view of US PGPub 2004/0168115 to Bauernschmidt et al have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicants' amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The rejections of **claims 24-25** under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicants' amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 7,065,742 to Bogdan (hereafter Bogdan) in**

view of US PGPub 2005/0149847 to Chandler (hereafter Chandler) in view of US Patent No 7,065,742 to Bogdan (hereafter Bogdan).

Referring to claim 3, the combination Chandler and Bogdan (hereafter Bogdan/Chandler) discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the input document is a structured document [XML document] (Chandler: see [0038], lines 1-2).

Referring to claim 4, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 3, wherein the structured document is encoded in Extensible Markup Language ("XML") (Chandler: see [0038], lines 1-2).

Referring to claim 5, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the generated output comprises at least one object representation generated from the input document (Bogdan: see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Referring to claim 7, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, to which the generated output must adhere (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

Referring to claim 8, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, indicating that the second schema definition is to be used by the validating parser when generating the output (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

Referring to claim 9, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 8, wherein the schema name is specified, by the application program, as a feature on an invocation of the validating parser (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 11, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first syntax level schema definition in the input document comprises a specification, is specified in the syntax of the input document, of the first schema definition (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 12, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first schema definition in specification has the syntax of the input document uses a schema location construct in the input document (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 13, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of casting objects, comprising:

providing a validating parser [XML parser] that is adapted for validating whether syntax elements of an input document conform to a first schema [extended schema] definition identified in the input document while generating output objects, from the validated syntax elements of the input document, that conform to a second schema definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output objects [manner defined by the application] (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser for validating whether the syntax elements of the input document conform to the first schema definition, wherein:

the first schema definition is an extended schema [extended schema] (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser, responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, for according to a first syntax level while generating the output objects to conform to the from the input using the validating parser, according to a second syntax level schema definition, wherein:

the second schema definition is a base schema [base UI hierarchy] from which the extended schema was extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the generating further comprises suppressing, by the validating parser not generating any output object for any of the at least one of the validated syntax element that is defined in the extended schema but not defined in the base schema elements from the generated output objects in order that the generated output objects will be valid according conform to the second syntax level schema definition [generate objects based on application] (see column 3, lines 27-42); and

providing the generated output objects, by the validating parser, for use by the consuming application program (column 3, lines 27-42).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further

limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

Referring to claim 20, Bogdan/Chandler discloses the method according to Claim 13, wherein: the first syntax level second schema definition is the base schema; an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the generating further comprises not generating any output object for any of the at least one syntax element that is defined in the intermediate schema but not in the base schema represents a plurality of extensions to the second syntax level (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

Referring to claim 31, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of providing validation and parsing for clients, comprising steps of:

a validating parser [XML parser] adapted for validating an input document while generating output, from the validated input document, according to a second schema

definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

to dynamically select a syntax abstraction level for use when generating output from the validating parser (see column 3, lines 27-42);

validating syntax elements of the input document with the provided validating parser according to the first schema definition, wherein the first schema definition validation is performed according to a first syntax level is an extended schema which specifies a syntax definition to which the syntax elements of the input document are to adhere (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, parsing the validated syntax elements to generate the output for the consuming application according to the second schema definition, wherein the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema was extended, thereby suppressing at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating the output for the consuming application, from the input document with the provided validating 18 parser, for use by the client, wherein: the generated output has syntax that conforms to the syntax abstraction level that has been dynamically selected by the client (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

the syntax abstraction level is a less-restrictive version of the first syntax level; and each of the suppressed syntax elements is valid according to the first syntax level extended schema but is not valid according to the syntax abstraction level base schema see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44.

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document and obtaining an input document to be validated and parsed. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitations wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]) and obtaining an input document to be validated and parsed for the client (see [0038], lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

Referring to claim 32, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of applying abstraction by a validating parser, comprising steps of:

Bogdan discloses using, by a validating parser, a first schema definition syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

omitting, by the validating parser, at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated wherein each of the omitted syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition syntax level but is not valid according to a

second schema definition syntax level for which the output is generated, wherein: the first schema definition is an extended schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema is extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

Referring to claim 33, Bogdan/Chandler discloses method according to Claim 32, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is dynamically requested, to the validating parser, by an application program for which the output is being generated (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

17 July 2008
kml